



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/977,716	10/15/2001	Mark I. Greene	PENN-0786	4425

7590 07/05/2002
Kathleen A. Tyrrell
Licata & Tyrrell
66 E. Main Street
Marlton, NJ 08053

EXAMINER

TUNG, JOYCE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1637

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/977,716

Applicant(s)

GREENE ET AL.

Examiner

Joyce Tung

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 45
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Action*

Art Unit: 1637

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claim 1 in Paper No.9 is acknowledged.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that the restriction requirement is not proper, because the search of Group I would also reveal any art relation to kits for use of the method of detecting molecules expressing a selected epitope, the method in profiling of proteins and developing and using systems for monitoring interaction of molecules and identifying components such as the epitope detectors. This is not found persuasive because the inventions are separately classified as set forth in the previous Office action. Thus, a search of one invention would not be coexamine with any other. Furthermore, the kit of Group II requires the elements of Group I, there is no requirements that selected epitope of Group I is the same as that of Group II. Clearly, a kit which detects molecular expression of the wrong epitope would not anticipate or makes obvious a kit comprising of claim 1, Finally, the removing group all would be searched separately for that of Group I, thus, requiring huge burdens of search. Therefore, the requirement is still deemed proper and is made FINAL.

2. Claims 2-14 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected Group II-VII, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 9 as discussed above.

Art Unit: 1637

Double Patenting

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of copending Application No. 09/783,896. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-14 of copending Application No. 09/783,896. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct

Art Unit: 1637

from each other because the instant claim 1 and claims 11-14 of copending Application No. 09/783,896 are drawn to a method for detecting molecules expressing a selected epitope in a sample involving immobilizing a molecule expressing a selected epitope to a selected surface, contacting the surface with an epitope detector which binds to the immobilized molecules and the epitope detector comprising an oligonucleotide attached to a monoclonal antibody, amplifying the oligonucleotide with fluorescent dye and measuring the fluorescence emitted from the stained oligonucleotide. Therefore, both inventions are overlapping in scope.

Thus, this is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Specification

7. The title of the invention is not descriptive because the old title is directed to method for immuno-detection of epitopes on molecules and for detection of interactions of molecules via fluorescent dyes, while the claim language is directed to a method of detecting molecules expressing a selected epitope via fluorescent dyes. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Information Disclosure Statement

8. The references lined through were not considered because the references were not provided in the application. In addition, the reference AB is required to have publication date.

Art Unit: 1637

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (Jpn. J. Cancer Res., 1995, Vol. 86, pg. 885-889.

Suzuki et al. disclose a sensitive method for the detection of antigen in sera in which a specific DNA molecule is used for a marker. The method requires a first monoclonal antibody immobilized which binds to a circulating antigens, a biotinylated second monoclonal antibody binds to the antigen. A biotinylated DNA complexed with antigen-antibody was amplified by PCR (See pg. 885, the abstract). The amplified product is stained with ethidium bromide for the detection (See pg. 887, column 1, fig. 1).

Since the language in step (a) "immobilizing a molecule expressing a selected epitope in a sample to a selected surface" does not explicitly describe what is encompassed on the selected surface for the molecule to bind on the surface, the teachings of Suzuki et al. anticipate the limitations of claim 1.

11. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joyce Tung whose telephone number is (703) 305-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM-4:30 PM.

Art Unit: 1637


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached at (703) 308-1119 on Monday-Friday from 10:00 AM-6:00 PM.

Any inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Chemical/Matrix receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

12. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 1637 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1 using (703) 305-3014 or 308-4242. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).

Joyce Tung

June 30, 2002


GARY BENZION, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600